Given n items with sizes  $s_1, \ldots, s_n$  where

$$1 > s_1 \ge \cdots \ge s_n > 0$$
.

Pack items into a minimum number of bins where each bin can hold items of total size at most 1.

### Theorem 5

There is no  $\rho$ -approximation for Bin Packing with  $\rho < 3/2$  unless P = NP.

### **Proof**

In the partition problem we are given positive integers  $b_1, \ldots, b_n$  with  $B = \sum_i b_i$  even. Can we partition the integers into two sets S and T s.t.

$$\sum_{i \in S} b_i = \sum_{i \in T} b_i ?$$

- ▶ We can solve this problem by setting  $s_i := 2b_i/B$  and asking whether we can pack the resulting items into 2 bins or not.
- A  $\rho$ -approximation algorithm with  $\rho < 3/2$  cannot output 3 or more bins when 2 are optimal.
- Hence, such an algorithm can solve Partition.

#### **Definition 6**

An asymptotic polynomial-time approximation scheme (APTAS) is a family of algorithms  $\{A_{\epsilon}\}$  along with a constant c such that  $A_{\epsilon}$  returns a solution of value at most  $(1+\epsilon){\rm OPT}+c$  for minimization problems.

- Note that for Set Cover or for Knapsack it makes no sense to differentiate between the notion of a PTAS or an APTAS because of scaling.
- However, we will develop an APTAS for Bin Packing.

Again we can differentiate between small and large items.

### Lemma 7

Any packing of items of size at most  $\gamma$  into  $\ell$  bins can be extended to a packing of all items into  $\max\{\ell,\frac{1}{1-\gamma}\mathrm{SIZE}(I)+1\}$  bins, where  $\mathrm{SIZE}(I)=\sum_i s_i$  is the sum of all item sizes.

- If after Greedy we use more than  $\ell$  bins, all bins (apart from the last) must be full to at least  $1 \gamma$ .
- ► Hence,  $r(1 y) \le SIZE(I)$  where r is the number of nearly-full bins.
- This gives the lemma.

Choose  $\gamma = \epsilon/2$ . Then we either use  $\ell$  bins or at most

$$\frac{1}{1 - \epsilon/2} \cdot \text{OPT} + 1 \le (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \text{OPT} + 1$$

bins.

It remains to find an algorithm for the large items.

### **Linear Grouping:**

Generate an instance I' (for large items) as follows.

- Order large items according to size.
- Let the first k items belong to group 1; the following k items belong to group 2; etc.
- Delete items in the first group;
- Round items in the remaining groups to the size of the largest item in the group.

#### Lemma 8

$$OPT(I') \le OPT(I) \le OPT(I') + k$$

#### Proof 1:

- Any bin packing for I gives a bin packing for I' as follows.
- Pack the items of group 2, where in the packing for I the items for group 1 have been packed;
- Pack the items of groups 3, where in the packing for I the items for group 2 have been packed;
- **•** . . .

#### Lemma 9

$$OPT(I') \le OPT(I) \le OPT(I') + k$$

#### Proof 2:

- ▶ Any bin packing for I' gives a bin packing for I as follows.
- Pack the items of group 1 into k new bins;
- Pack the items of groups 2, where in the packing for I' the items for group 2 have been packed;
- **.**..

Assume that our instance does not contain pieces smaller than  $\epsilon/2$ . Then  ${\rm SIZE}(I) \geq \epsilon n/2$ .

We set  $k = \lfloor \epsilon \text{SIZE}(I) \rfloor$ .

Then  $n/k \le 2n/\lfloor \epsilon^2 n/2 \rfloor \le 4/\epsilon^2$  (here we used  $\lfloor \alpha \rfloor \ge \alpha/2$  for  $\alpha \ge 1$ ).

Hence, after grouping we have a constant number of piece sizes  $(4/\epsilon^2)$  and at most a constant number  $(2/\epsilon)$  can fit into any bin.

We can find an optimal packing for such instances by the previous Dynamic Programming approach.

cost (for large items) at most

$$OPT(I') + k \le OPT(I) + \epsilon SIZE(I) \le (1 + \epsilon)OPT(I)$$

running time  $\mathcal{O}((\frac{2}{\epsilon}n)^{4/\epsilon^2})$ .